

MARY M. BENDIK.
Serial No.: 10/027,879

8

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 17 and 19-26 remain before the Examiner for reconsideration.

In the Office Action dated April 19, 2005 the Examiner indicated that "the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Porter has been withdrawn in view of the amendment [filed September 27, 2004]."

Applicants, further acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claim 11 is allowed and the Examiner's indication that claims 6 and 22 are objected to "as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

In the Office Action, the Examiner once again rejected claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17, 19, 21, 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) "as being unpatentable over Porter et al. (US Pat No. 5,845,067, 12/1/98, filed 9/9/96) in view of Herr-Hoyman et al. (US Pat No. 5,727,156, 3/10/98, filed 4/10/96)." Specifically, the Examiner assured that:

Regarding independent claim 1, Porter discloses:

- creating a document profile that includes fields of attributes of a document for each of the documents (col 3, lines 45-55, col 7, lines 26-67, figure 7)
- each document has a unique identifier for identifying the location of the document content in the file system (col 11, lines 44-55) where the unique identifier being visible to users of the document management system and providing information about the document to the users (col 11, lines 44-62: the fact that the list of the document keys is accessed by users where a document key consists of a document identifier and a service identifier suggests that the unique identifier be visible to users since the unique identifier would be also accessed when users accessing the document keys; also, since the unique identifier provides the location of the document in the file system, the unique identifier provides information about the document to users)
- storing the document profile for each of the documents (figure 2)

Porter does not disclose:

MARY M. BENDIK.
Serial No.: 10/027,879

9

- the unique identifier of a document including at least a first portion including information descriptive of an attribute of the document and at least a second portion including an automatically generated number

Herr-Hoyman discloses a scheme for generating a unique identifier wherein the unique identifier including a short sequence of characters related to a company name, possibly including additional characters or digits to ensure that the generated unique ID is unique (col 3, lines 57-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Herr-Hoyman into Porter since Herr-Hoyman discloses a scheme for generating a unique identifier that includes a sequence of characters such as a company name with additional digits, providing the advantage to apply the unique document identifier scheme to generating a document identifier in Porter. By having the company name with a number or a digit to make each document identifier to be unique, each of the documents in the company can be identified from the corresponding unique identifier among the other identifiers of other documents in the company, which is equivalent to the group of unique identifiers corresponding to the other documents. The combination of Herr-Hoyman into Porter would provide a fast way for identifying a document when accessing a document in a database.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Porter does not disclose that the first portion of the document identifier is descriptive of the author of the document. As mentioned in claim 1, Herr-Hoyman discloses that the unique ID includes a short sequence of characters related to a company name (col 3, lines 58-62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Herr-Hoyman into Porter since Herr-Hoyman teaches the sequence of characters is a company name and Porter provides author's name as one of the properties of a document. This motivates to use the author's name instead of the company name as a portion of the document identifier for providing the information of a document.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, which is dependent on claims 1 and 2 respectively, as disclosed in claim 1, Herr-Hoyman provides the sequential numbers in addition to the sequence of characters to ensure that the generated unique ID is unique (col 3, lines 57-65).

Regarding claim 5, Porter discloses that when a new document is entered into the document management system, the document content and the document profile are indexed (col 11, lines 16-22) for the purpose of criteria searching. The document identifier, therefore, is generated from the beginning before the document is entered (col 11, lines 16-51).

MARY M. BENDIK.
Serial No.: 10/027,879

10

Also, Herr-Hoyman discloses that the first step when creating the web pages, the author of the web pages enter company data, which is an attribute of a web page and is an element to generate the unique ID (col 3, lines 50-65).

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Porter discloses the step of creating a link in the document profile to a file type that is not created within the document management system (col 3, lines 45-65: the document profile is transmitted via the messaging system where the recipient of the copy of the document profile may be another file system or another server where another file system or another server is not within the document management system).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Porter does not explicitly disclose creating of an email message via a messaging system external to the document management system including a link to document profile using a selector within the document management system so that the recipient of the message can access the document associated with the document profile if the recipient has appropriate authorization to access the document associated with the document profile. However, Porter does disclose:

- the document profile is transmitted via the messaging system where the recipient of the copy of the document profile may be another file system or another server where it is clear that another file system or another server is not within the document management system (col 3, lines 45-55)
- the access permission for the document profile where different levels of access permission ranging from authorization to see, to access and edit the document content, or change the access permission depending on whether the individual is a member in the group or not (col 8, lines 10-34)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Porter to include the step of creating an email message via a messaging system external to the document management system since the recipient of the transmitted document profile can be from another system or another server, which means an external system, and the fact that the document profile is transmitted by a messaging system including an email further suggests that the messaging system of the recipient linking to document profile in the document management system is external to the document management system. Further, the access permission to the document associated with the document file suggests that a recipient of a transmitted document can access the document profile if the recipient has an access authorization. Also, it was well known that in sending a message, a SEND button, among

MARY M. BENDIK.
Serial No.: 10/027,879

11

other buttons on the window, is selected to press for sending a message. Said button, thus, is considered as a selector in the document management system. Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Porter discloses that the email message via a messaging system external to the document management system including a copy of the document using a selector within the document management system so that the recipient of the message can access the copy of the document (col 3, lines 28-55: the recipient of the document copy is from another file system or another server, which is external to the document management system; figure 8A, col 16, lines 59-65: accessing the document content based on the information of the profile; the selector feature is mentioned in claim 8; col 8, lines 20-26).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Porter discloses the defining of user access permission in the document profile, wherein the step of defining user access permission includes the step of acquiring the identity of the user from a source external to the document management system (col 8, lines 10-34, col 13, lines 45-61).

Independent claim 12 includes the limitations of claims 1 and 7, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have recognized that the file type is a word processing document as in Porter (figure 7, col 7, lines 29-31).

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 12, Porter discloses the file type is an email record (col 3, lines 35-50).

Independent claim 15 includes the limitations of claims 1, 7 and 8, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 17 includes the limitations of claims 1 and 9, and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent on claim 10, Porter discloses that the source of identity of the user is an operating system security system or a database security system (col 14, lines 10-18).

Claims 21, 23-26 are for the document management system of method claims 1, 7-10, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

With regard to Applicants' arguments filed September 27, 2004, the Examiner asserted that:

MARY M. BENDIK.
Serial No.: 10/027,879

12

Applicant's arguments filed 9/27/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 21, Applicants state that the Examiner admitted Porter does not disclose the generation of a unique identifier for documents in a document management system (Remarks, page 14).

Examiner does not agree completely.

In the previous office action, the Examiner showed that Porter does teach each document has a unique identifier to identify the location of a document in a file system (previous office action, pages 3, 12). The Examiner only admitted that an identifier such that it includes at least a first portion including information descriptive of an attribute of the document and at least a second portion including an automatically generated number for identifying a document is not disclosed in Porter.

Herr-Hoyman discloses the unique identifier for identifying a web page, which is a document, for accessing a document where each unique identifier is generated by including a sequence of characters such as a company name and additional digits to make the identifier unique (col 3, lines 57-67). Therefore, unique document identifiers in a company are equivalent to unique identifiers in a group, and each document in a company can be identified by the additional digits along with the company name included in each unique identifier. This shows that Herr-Hoyman discloses "generating a unique identifier for each of the documents, the unique identifier including at least a first portion including information descriptive of an attribute of the document and at least a second portion including an automatically generated number, the unique identifier being visible to users of the document management system and providing information about the corresponding document to the users so that each of the documents can be identified from the corresponding unique identifier among a group including unique identifiers corresponding to other documents" as claimed.

Regarding claims 7 and 12, Applicants argue that Peter does not disclose or suggest further linking or creating a link in the document profile to a file type that is not created within the document management system since the "link" feature of the invention links documents from, for example, other database systems (i.e. e-mail, discussion databases, calendar files, to-do lists, financial data warehouse system, and external file that from a floppy, cd-rom, external file system, etc.) (Remarks, page 15).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Porter does disclose that the file is connected to a conventional messaging system related to an email system, and the document profile is transmitted

MARY M. BENDIK.
Serial No.: 10/027,879

13

via the messaging system where the recipient of the copy of the document profile may be another file system or another server (col 3, lines 35-65, figure 2). It is clear that the messaging system is not within the file system, which is equivalent to the document management system. Therefore, such transmitting shows linking the document profile to a message, which is a file type that is not created within the document management system.

Regarding claims 8 and 15, Applicants argue that Porter does not disclose or suggest creating an email message via a messaging system external to the document management system including a link to the document profile using a selector within the document management system so that a recipient of the message can access the document associated with the document profile if the recipient has appropriate authorization to access the document associated with the document profile (Remarks, page 16).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Porter discloses the document profile is transmitted via the messaging system where may be another file system or another server where another file system or another server is not within the document management system (col 3, lines 35-55). Porter further discloses the access permission for the document profile where different levels of access permission ranging from authorization to see, to access and edit the document content, or change the access permission depending on whether the individual is a member in the group or not (col 8, lines 10-34).

As mentioned above, the messaging system is not included in the file system, which is a conventional data management. The messaging system, thus, is external to the document management system. Associating the document profile in the messaging system with the document content in the file system (col 3, lines 45-48) show linking between the document profile and the message so that the access to each document is dependent on the user's authorization to see each document.

Regarding claims 9 and 17, Applicants argue that Porter does not disclose creating an email message via messaging system external to the document management system including a copy of the document using a selector within the document management system so that a recipient of the message can access the copy of the document (Remarks, page 17).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Porter discloses the messaging (email) system stores the document profile (figure 2, #260) where the messaging system is external to the file system, which is a conventional data management (figure 2, col 3, lines 28-34) and equivalent to the document management system as claimed. Porter further discloses that a user can access a document profile dependent on the access

MARY M. BENDIK,
Serial No.: 10/027,879

14

permission of the user (col 8, lines 10-26). Since the document profile is included in the messaging system, the fact that a user can access the document profile suggests that the messaging system, external to the file system, take the user to the document profile if the user has an access authorization. Also, the fact that a user can access and edit a document associated with a document profile if the user has an access permission (col 8, lines 10-26) shows that the external messaging system can be used to route a document upon selecting the document using a selector for a proper profile for user.

For the reasons set forth in the Amendment filed September 27, 2004 and other reasons, Applicant respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Nonetheless, in the interest of expedient prosecution, Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 6, which was indicated by the Examiner to be allowable. Further, independent claims 12, 15 and 17 have been amended to depend upon allowed claim 11. Still further, independent claim 21 has been amended to include the limitation of allowable claim 22. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17, 19, 21, 23-26 are in form for allowance.

The Examiner rejected Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) "as being unpatentable over Porter et al. (US Pat No. 5,845,067, 12/1/98, filed 9/9/96)." Specifically, the Examiner assured that:

Regarding independent claim 20, Porter discloses:

- for each document, creating at least one document profile that includes fields of attributes of an associated document content (col 3, lines 45-55, col 7, lines 25-67, figure 7)
- storing the document profile in a database (col 7, line 26 to col 8, line 34, figure 2, #260)
- creating document content associated with the document profile (col 3, lines 45-48; col 7, lines 25-67, figure 2, #230)
- storing the document content external to the database in a file system of a first storage device (figure 2: the document content 230 is stored external to the database of the document profile 260 in a file system)
- defining in the document management system at least a second storage device to which the document content is to be automatically

MARY M. BENDIK.
Serial No.: 10/027,879

15

copied when stored in the first storage device (figure 8A, #842: copying document from file system to temp directory implies that the temp directory, which is equivalent to a second storage, to which the document content is to be automatically copied when stored in the first storage, which is the file system)

- automatically copying the document content from the first storage device to a second storage device (figure 8A, #842: copying the document content from file system, which is the first storage, to the temp directory, which is the second storage)

Porter does not explicitly disclose exiting document. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Porter to include exiting document since it was well known to exit a document by closing it.

With respect to Applicant's arguments set forth in the Amendment filed September 27, 2005, the Examiner asserted that:

Regarding independent claim 20, Applicants argue that Porter does not disclose or suggest a document management system in which one can define at least a second storage area to which the document content is to be copied when stored in the first storage and subsequent automatic copying a saved document to that second storage area (Remarks, page 19).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Porter discloses a first storage, which is the file system for storing documents (figure 2, #220, #230). Porter also discloses that a second storage, which is the temp directory, is defined, so that document in the file system is copied to the temp directory (figure 8A, #842).

For the reasons set forth in the Amendment filed September 27, 2004 and other reasons, Applicant respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Nonetheless, in the interest of expedient prosecution, Applicant has amended independent claim 20 to include the limitation that the method include the step of requiring selection of a predefined document template from a set of predefined document templates for the document during creation of the document profile, wherein the document template defines the format of the document and a software application to use for generation of the document. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 20 is in form for allowance.

MARY M. BENDIK.
Serial No.: 10/027,879

16

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of the claims, indicate the allowability of claims, and arrange for an official Notice of Allowance to be issued in due course.

Date: October 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

MARY M. BENDIK.

By Henry E. Bartony Jr.

Henry E. Bartony, Jr., Esq.
Reg. No. 34,772

Bartony & Hare, LLP
Law & Finance Building
Suite 1801
429 Fourth Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219
412-338-8632 (telephone)
412-338-6611 (fax)

Attorney for Applicant